DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 375 CG 007 754

TITLE	Extension and Improvement of Psychological Services Provided to Children in Areas of Economic Deprivation, January 31, 1966 - June 17, 1966.
INSTITUTION	Milwaukee Public Schools, Wis. Div. of Curriculum and Instruction.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Div. of Compensatory Education.
PUB DATE	66
NOTE	28p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Attendance; Behavioral Counseling; *Economically Disadvantaged; Educational Research; *Elementary School Students; Learning Difficulties; Program Evaluation; *Psychological Services; Research Methodology; Research Projects; *School Psychologists; *Secondary School Students

ABSTRACT

The study is a project undertaken by the school psychologists of the Milwaukee Public Schools in order to evaluate the psychological services provided to primary and secondary school children from areas of economic deprivation who are experiencing learning or behavioral problems. Research design was of the test-retest variety; specifically, I.Q. tests, three achievement tests, and a student attitude instrument were administered just prior to the student's first contact with the school psychologist and again at the end of the school year. Results were not significant at the .05 level; thus, conclusions could not be drawn. In addition, school records were checked and these revealed a significant increase in student attendance coinciding with the semester when they received psychological service. Finally, a descriptive evaluation of the program was achieved through questionnaires. While teachers felt that psychological services were of some value in dealing with particular learning and behavior problems, school administrators responded that the program was more than satisfactory in fostering good teaching morale, in developing a good teaching-learning environment, and in contributing to out-of-school activities. Appendices include several of the forms used in evaluation. (Author/SES)

ED 072375

CG 007 754

D

4

MILWAUKEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Division of Curriculum and Instruction

EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES PROVIDED TO CHILDREN IN AREAS OF ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION

JANUARY 31, 1966 - JUNE 17, 1966

PROGRAM EVALUATION

conducted by

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES AND EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FUNDED UNDER TITLE 1 OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

P0001525

PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROJECT - SPRING, 1966

Harold S. Vincent, Superintendent of Schools

Dwight Teel, Assistant Superintendent
Division of Curriculum and Instruction

William Ashbaugh, Executive Director
Department of Psychological Services
and Educational Research

Margaret Bernauer, Coordinator
Psychological Services

John Jackson, Supervisor
Psychological Services

Helen Brandt, School Psychologist

Dennis Campbell, School Psychologist

John Haase, School Psychologist

Frankie Jones, School Psychologist

EVALUATION PERSONNEL

William Ashbaugh, Executive Director
Department of Psychological Services
and Educational Research

G. Dwight Rowe, Coordinator of Educational Research

John Belton, Supervisor of Educational Research

John F. Keysor, Research Assistant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
POPULATION SERVED BY PROJECT	2
DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT PROCEDURES AND ACTIVITIES	3
EVALUATION PROCEDURE	4
EVALUATION RESULTS	7
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	17
APPENDIXES	19

INTRODUCTION

General Purpose

This project is an extension of services of the school psychologists in the Milwaukee Public Schools. It is specifically designed to meet the needs of both primary and secondary school children from areas of economic deprivation who require professional evaluation and/or diagnosis of special learning or behavior characteristics.

The school psychologists are responsible to the Department of Psychological Services and Educational Research in the Central Office. This department has been functioning for some time, however, the number of school psychologists retained in the past was not of sufficient size to handle the number of referrals from the various schools throughout the system. This program, then, is designed to expand the staff of school psychologists so that more children in the target area can receive the services of a school psychologist.

Project Significance

This project is unique in that it offers individual help to children in the target area who are experiencing learning or behavioral problems. The information derived from the psychological evaluation can be applied through various school personnel (teachers, principals, social workers, etc.) to provide assistance in alleviating the factors causing the problems.

Project Dates

Four school psychologists were retained during the second semester

of the 1965-66 school year. The effective start dates for these four school psychologists were:

1. Helen Brandt - March 14, 1966
2. Dennis Campbell - March 15, 1966
3. John Haase - March 1, 1966
4. Frankie Jones - January 28, 1966

In addition, these school psychologists were supported by Dr. John Jackson--a Supervisor in the Department of Psychological Services and Educational Research.

Project Objectives

The specific objectives of this project were:

1. Increased motivation for school work.
2. Increased achievement.
3. Improved learning skills.
4. Improved self-concept.
5. Readiness for academic learning including lengthened span of attention and improved work-study skills.
6. Decreased problems of behavior and emotional maladjustment.
7. Improved attendance.
8. Ability to use cultural assets in adjusting to the larger American culture in which they live.
9. Clarified, realistic vocational goals.

POPULATION SERVED BY PROJECT

Schools Included in the Project

The proposal stipulated that 14 school psychologists and one supervisor would be retained by this project to serve schools in areas of economic deprivation. However, recruitment problems were difficult, and while 14 psychologists were hired (and will be working during the 1966-67 school year) only four of these could begin work during the spring semester of 1966. Three of the four school psychologists processed referrals from various target area public schools in the Milwaukee system, and

referrals from target area parochial schools were handled by the other school psychologist. Psychologists served in the following public schools:

1. Custer High School
2. Lincoln Junior-Senior High School
3. Riverside High School
4. Robert Fulton Junior High School
5. Walker Junior High School
6. Clarke Street School
7. Fourth Street School
8. Fratney Street School
9. Greenfield School
10. Rutherford B. Hayes School
11. Hopkins Street School
12. Lloyd Street School
13. Ninth Street School
14. Henry L. Palmer School
15. James Whitcomb Riley School

The parochial schools served by this project were Catholic and Lutheran (Missouri Synod) schools from areas of economic deprivation.

Pupils Served by the Project

The four school psychologists retained under Title I had contact with a total of 329 students between the time which they were hired and the end of the school year. Diagnostic case studies were written on 179 students, contact with the 150 was for the purpose of consultation.

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT PROCEDURES AND ACTIVITIES

Selection Procedures

The public school children involved in this project were selected in the same manner as all other students who receive psychological service. That is, teachers and principals in the various schools prepare referral forms which are sent to the Department of Psychological Services and Educational Research. The school psychologist receives a copy of the referral form, and then schedules the activities required to handle

the case. The selection of pupils is based more on the individual needs of students as judged by school personnel than on any other factor.

Program Operation Procedure

Once the referrals have been received by the school psychologist, an initial consultation session is scheduled. Based on the school psychologist's evaluation of the initial consultation, a diagnostic case study of the individual will usually be undertaken.

The case study may include administration of individual intelligence tests (e.g., Binet, W.I.S.C., W.A.I.S.), projective tests (e.g., H.T.P., T.A.T., Rorschach), achievement tests (e.g., W.R.A.T., C.A.T.), and tests of sensory--motor functioning (e.g., Bender, Frostig). After testing is complete, the school psychologist then prepares a report including any specific recommendations. This report is used as a basis for future activities with the student. Recommendations may be discussed with teachers, principals, social workers, parents, etc. so that appropriate action can be taken.

EVALUATION PROCEDURE

Design Description

In order to evaluate this program, a test--retest type of design was employed. In addition to this basic design, a descriptive evaluation of the program was achieved through questionnaires. Specifically this design includes:

1. An I.Q. test which was administered just before the student's first contact with the school psychologist, and again at the end of the school year.
2. Three achievement tests (reading vocabulary, arithmetic

reasoning, and spelling) which were given at the same time as the I.Q. test.

3. A student attitude instrument which was administered at the same time as the I.Q. and achievement tests.

4. A standard interview schedule for the regular classroom teachers.

5. A questionnaire which was completed by school administrators from the schools receiving services offered by this project.

6. An examination of school records.

All testing was given by a certified teacher who was not assigned in any manner to psychological services. Thus, testing bias in this evaluation should be at a minimum.

Sample Selection

Twenty-one students from nine different schools were originally chosen for the evaluation sample. However, when post-testing was initiated, two of the 21 were not available for testing. One of the two had dropped out of school for an extended illness, and the other had been removed to the County Home of Dependent Children. The loss of these two reduced the sample size to 19. The distribution of the sample according to grade level was:

1. Primary (Grades 1-3) -- 7 Students
2. Elementary (Grades 4-6) -- 5 Students
3. Junior High (Grades 7-9) -- 4 Students
4. High School (Grades 10-12) -- 3 Students

The procedure for selecting the evaluation sample was to include all students seen by two of the school psychologists in the two week time period of March 23, 1966 to April 6, 1966. These students were referred in the conventional manner, and no special scheduling was involved. They constituted a normal two-week activity schedule for each of the two psychologists.

Data Collection Schedule

The I.Q. and achievement tests and the student attitude instrument were administered as a pretest just prior to the initial contact between the school psychologist and the student. All pretesting was done between March 22, 1966 and April 1, 1966. Post-tests were given between May 25, 1966 and June 7, 1966. Interviews with the regular classroom teachers of the students in the evaluation sample were taken between June 8 and June 17 with a standard interview schedule, and questionnaires were mailed to school administrators on June 1.

Procedure for Analysis of Data

The pretest and post-test I.Q. scores were compared by a standard "t" test. The reading vocabulary, arithmetic reasoning, and spelling achievement tests were compared by the "Difference Between Means - Correlated Data Method". The basic procedure involved in this method was to identify the level of advancement or retardation in each of the individual achievement areas on both the pretest and the post-test. The change in retardation or advancement was then determined for each participant, and these were analyzed to determine if the changes were significant.

The data from the student attitude instrument were analyzed with a "t" test. The attitude instrument incorporated six concepts which the students were to respond to on a seven-point Likert scale (See Appendix A). A "t" value was computed for each of the six concepts to determine if there was significant change in attitude.

The data obtained from the regular classroom teachers and school administrators were simply tabulated to give a composite subjective

evaluation of the value of the program. This type of data does not lend itself to comparative statistical analysis.

The design for this evaluation required that school attendance and conduct data be examined to determine if change occurred in these areas. A comparison of the attendance for the first semester, when the students did not receive psychological treatment (consultation diagnostic service) and the second semester when the students did receive psychological treatment, was made with a "X^2 " test.

Data Collection Procedure Limitations

The data collected to evaluate this program are limited by the absence of a comparative control group, by test norms which are not completely appropriate, and by the common difficulties encountered in measuring attitudes. A control group was not selected because the administrative task of selecting a valid comparison group was too great to implement in the time allotted for program evaluation. Appropriate test norms for children from areas of economic deprivation are not available. Conventional test norms do not necessarily reflect the culture of the children in this program. The student attitude instrument was constructed by the research staff of the Milwaukee Public Schools, and complete validity data are not yet collected concerning this instrument.

EVALUATION RESULTS

Change in I.Q.

In order to determine if a change had occurred in the functional capacities that are basic to learning, problem-solving, and responding to new situations, a standardized intelligence test was administered as

a pretest and a post-test to students in the evaluation sample. It is felt that an increase in I.Q. would relate to the following objectives mentioned earlier in this report:

1. Improved learning skills.
2. Increased readiness for academic learning.
3. An increase in the ability to use cultural assets in adjusting to the larger American culture in which they live.

The test chosen for this measurement was the California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity (C.T.M.M.). This test is composed of two basic parts--a non-language section and a language section. The former measures the examinee's mental capacities through items that require the recognition or logical analysis of abstract relationships, and the latter samples the ability to comprehend verbal and numerical concepts of various types. The two sections can also be combined to yield a total score. The comparative results for the C.T.M.M. testing is shown in Table 1. These data are based on the 19 students in the evaluation sample.

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF C.T.M.M. TESTING RESULTS

TEST SECTION	MEAN I.Q. FIRST ADMINISTRATION	MEAN I.Q. SECOND ADMINISTRATION	"t" VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE AT THE .05 LEVEL
Non-language I.Q.	83.63	91.15	1.26	Not Significant
Language I.Q.	74.63	78.73	0.67	Not Significant
Total I.Q.	76.57	82.84	1.08	Not Significant

The data in Table 1 indicate that although the I.Q. scores for all sections of the test increased, the increase was not statistically significant at the .05 level, and these results could have occurred by chance. These findings dictate that no conclusions can be drawn concerning I.Q. change, however, the data appear promising in view of the short time interval of program operation in that all changes were positive which may be a trend.

Change in Academic Achievement

In order to evaluate the objective of increased achievement, three parts of the California Achievement Tests-Complete Battery were given to the 19 students in the evaluation sample. The parts of the test that were given are reading vocabulary, arithmetic reasoning, and spelling. Alternate forms of the test were given--one as a pretest and the other as a post-test. The mean retardations in grade levels for the achievement tests, and the results of the analysis of the difference between means-

correlated data is given in Table 2. The data are based on 16 of the 19 students in the evaluation sample. The other three could not take the achievement tests because of severe reading defiencies.

TABLE 2

RESULTS OF ACHIEVEMENT TESTING

TEST	MEAN RETARDATION PRETEST	MEAN RETARDATION POST-TEST	z SCORE FOR DIFFERENCE	SIGNIFICANCE AT THE .05 LEVEL
Reading Vocabulary	2.25 grades	2.15 grades	0.47	Not Significant
Arithmetic Reasoning	2.11 grades	2.19 grades	-0.56	Not Significant
Spelling	2.34 grades	2.55 grades	-1.24	Not Significant

The data in Table 2 indicate that the achievement retardation of the sample referred for psychological service was severe at the times of both tests. Changes in achievement were not significant at the .05 level so no conclusions can be drawn. However, the data are important because they illustrate the extreme cases which are dealt with by school psychologists, and the pressing need to help these children.

Student Attitude Difference

The student attitude instrument was administered to determine if the students in the evaluation sample had changed their self-concepts and their feelings about school or school related topics. The same attitude instrument was given twice--once before contact with the school psychologist and again at the end of the school year. The attitude

instrument elicited a response from the pupils concerning their feelings about:

1. Their school
2. Teachers in their school
3. Homework
4. Subjects taught in their school
5. Other students in their school
6. Themselves in school

Since the students responded on a seven-point Likert scale, a numerical value could be assigned to each response. A "t" value comparing the responses on the first administration with the responses on the second was then computed for each of the six concepts, and these "t" values are shown in Table 3. The most positive response possible was assigned a numerical value of seven, a neutral response was assigned a value of four, and the most negative response was assigned a numerical value of one.

TABLE 3

"t" VALUES FOR THE ATTITUDE INSTRUMENT

CONCEPT	MEAN VALUE FIRST ADMINISTRATION	MEAN VALUE SECOND ADMINISTRATION	"t" VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE AT THE .05 LEVEL
My school	5.50	5.50	0	Not Significant
Teachers in my school	5.00	4.42	-0.71	Not Significant
Homework	5.35	4.64	-0.40	Not Significant
The subjects taught in my school	4.93	5.21	0.38	Not Significant
Other students in my school	5.50	5.57	0.10	Not Significant
Myself in school	5.57	4.64	-1.37	Not Significant

None of the attitude changes indicated in Table 3 were statistically significant at the .05 level so no conclusions can be drawn concerning this measure. However, it should be pointed out that attitude changes might have occurred, but were not picked up by the instrument. It is also possible that attitudes were more negative at the second administration because this period coincided with final exams, and this may have had an effect on attitude.

Improved Attendance

School records were consulted in order to determine if the attendance of the pupils in the evaluation sample changed between the first

semester (before psychological treatment) and the second semester (during psychological treatment). The attendance data are based on 18 of the 19 students in the evaluation sample. Attendance records on one student were not compiled by the school because of the frequency of absence. The total attendance data for the 18 students was:

First semester -- 1496.5 days present and 159.5 days absent.
Second semester -- 1549.5 days present and 106.5 days absent.

A X^2 analysis of the total days present and absent revealed $X^2 = 11.486$ which is statistically significant beyond the .01 level. Thus a significant increase in student attendance coincided with the semester when they received psychological service.

Classroom Teacher Reactions

The reactions of regular classroom teachers concerning the value of the results of psychological service were solicited with a standard interview schedule (See Appendix B). The interviews were conducted by the writer, not by a school psychologist, and interviewer bias was held to a minimum. A total of 19 interviews were completed constituting 100 per cent of the evaluation sample.

The interview schedule was used to elicit reponses from the classroom teachers which were classified according to the following key:

0 - Does not apply
1 - Marked positive change
2 - Small positive change
3 - No change
4 - Small negative change
5 - Marked negative change

A tabulation of the teacher responses to the first ten items on the interview schedule is given in Table 4.

TABLE 4

TEACHER INTERVIEW RESPONSES

ITEM	KEYED RESPONSES (+) 0	1	2	3	4	(-) 5	NO OPINION	TOTAL
HAS THERE BEEN A CHANGE IN:								
1. The problem that prompted your decision to refer the student to the school psychologist?	3	2	3	10	0	0	1	19
2. The student's motivation toward schoolwork?	8	0	5	5	0	0	1	19
3. The achievement level of the student?	2	1	3	11	0	1	1	19
4. The student's attitude about school and schoolwork?	4	0	7	6	1	0	1	19
5. The student's confidence relative to his activities at school?	4	0	8	5	1	0	1	19
6. The ability of the student to focus his attention on the subjects taught in class?	4	0	6	8	0	0	1	19
7. The ability of the student to concentrate on material to be studied?	3	0	5	9	1	0	1	19
8. The student's overt behavior pattern in class?	4	0	5	9	0	0	1	19
9. The way the student is accepted by his classmates?	5	0	3	10	0	0	1	19
10. Your own ability to teach children with special learning problems, as a result of your activities with the school psychologist?	8	1	2	5	0	0	3	19
TOTAL	45	4	47	78	3	1	12	190

The general consensus of the teachers was that the students frequently displayed small positive changes in the characteristics described, but that marked changes were infrequent. The data would seem to indicate that the students tended to remain the same, but changes that occur immediately after psychological treatment will normally be slightly positive.

The teachers were also asked to indicate their feelings of the effectiveness of the psychological services rendered. The responses to this question are shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5

EFFECTIVENESS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES

VALUE JUDGMENT	NUMBER	PER CENT OF TOTAL
Very Effective	1	5
Mostly Effective	3	16
Slightly Effective	12	63
Not Effective	1	5
No Opinion	2	11
TOTAL	19	100

In summary, the regular classroom teachers indicated that the functions of the school psychologists were slightly effective. They also indicated that the changes called out by the program objectives were fulfilled to some degree by part of the students in the evaluation sample.

Administrator Reactions

The principals of the 15 schools which received service from an E.S.E.A. funded school psychologist were asked to indicate their opinion concerning the effect which this program had on:

1. Teaching-learning environment
2. Teacher morale
3. Out-of-school activities

The administrators were requested to assign a value to the above classifications according to the following key:

3 - Outstanding
2 - Satisfactory
1 - Unsatisfactory
0 - No Opinion

The responses from the 15 principals were tabulated, and mean values calculated. These data are shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6

PRINCIPAL REACTIONS

PROGRAM EFFECT ON	ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS Number Responding	ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS Mean Value	SECONDARY PRINCIPALS Number Responding	SECONDARY PRINCIPALS Mean Value
Teaching-learning environment	10	2.10	5	2.33
Teacher morale	10	2.13	5	2.67
Out-of-school activities	10	2.17	5	2.00

The data indicate that, in the opinion of the principals, psychological services are contributing a positive effect to teacher morale, teaching-learning environment, and ancillary school activities. In some cases the effect is approaching the value of "outstanding".

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Project Description

This program initially called for 15 school psychologists to be added to the existing staff in order to expand and enhance the services rendered to public and parochical schools in areas of economic deprivation. However, due to a shortage of available personnel, only four school psychologists could begin work during the spring semester. Three of these psychologists served to some degree 15 public schools. The other school psychologist, served parochical school children exclusively.

Objective Evaluation of I.Q. Change

In order to determine if an I.Q. change occurred in the 19 students in the evaluation sample, the California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity was administered as a pretest and again as a post-test. Although the students had an I.Q. increase in all classifications, the increases were not significant at the .05 level, and no conclusion can be drawn concerning these data. However, the data are encouraging in view of the short period of program operation. The time period between the pretesting and post-testing was approximately two months.

Objective Evaluation of Student Achievement Changes

Student achievement was measured in a pretest and a post-test in the areas of reading vocabulary, arithmetic reasoning, and spelling. Alternate forms of the California Achievement Tests-Complete Battery were used for this testing, and a comparison of the retardations for the specific skills tested indicated that the differences were not significant at the .05 level. Although no conclusions can be drawn concerning the effect of the treatment, the retardations were so severe that

they vividly illustrated the great need these children have for special help.

Comparison of Attendance

A X^2 analysis was performed on the evaluation sample to determine if there was a difference in attendance before and after psychological testing. School records revealed that the attendance of students in the evaluation sample was significantly higher beyond the .01 level during the semester when they received treatment from a school psychologist. The comparison was made with attendance data from the semester immediately prior to psychological treatment.

Teacher and Principal Reactions

Reactions to this program were elicited from principals and regular classroom teachers. The results of this subjective evaluation indicated that the teachers felt psychological services was of some value in dealing with particular learning and behavior problems, and most felt that psychological services was of some value to the school community. The school administrators felt that the program was more than satisfactory in fostering good teacher morale, in developing a good teaching-learning environment, and in contributing to out-of-school activities. The program seemed to be well received in the schools. However data derived directly from pupil measures (I.Q., achievement, and attendance) is generally more positive than that derived from the teachers reaction to a questionnaire. This may suggest the need for more contact between teacher and psychologist.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

MILWAUKEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

STUDENT ATTITUDE INSTRUMENT

School _____

Class _____

Date _____

Name _____

How I feel about:

1. MY SCHOOL

Very bad _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ Very good

2. TEACHERS IN MY SCHOOL

Very good _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ Very bad

3. HOMEWORK

Very good _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ Very bad

4. THE SUBJECTS TAUGHT IN MY SCHOOL

Very bad _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ Very good

5. THE OTHER STUDENTS IN MY SCHOOL

Very bad _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ Very good

6. MYSELF IN SCHOOL

Very good _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ Very bad

APPENDIX B

MILWAUKEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE
for
E.S.E.A. Project--Expansion of Psychological Services

Dear Teacher:

One of your students, _____, was referred to a school psychologist during the second semester of the 1965-1966 school year. We are interested in your reactions as to the changes which occurred in this student because of the psychological evaluation and subsequent treatment. Would you please answer the questions listed below according to the following key:

0 - Does not apply
1 - Marked positive change
2 - Small positive change
3 - No change
4 - Small negative change
5 - Marked negative change

__3__ Example: Has there been a change in effectiveness with which the student participates in group activities.

_____ 1. Has there been a change in the problem that prompted your decision to refer the student to the school psychologist?

_____ 2. Has there been a change in the student's motivation toward schoolwork?

_____ 3. Has there been a change in the achievement level of the student?

_____ 4. Has the student changed his attitude about school and schoolwork?

_____ 5. Has there been a change in the student's confidence relative to his activities at school?

_____ 6. Has there been a change in the ability of the student to focus his attention on the subjects taught in class?

_____ 7. Has there been a change in the ability of the student to concentrate on material to be studied?

_____ 8. Has there been a change in the student's overt behavior pattern in class?

_____ 9. Has there been a change in the way the student is accepted by his classmates?

_____ 10. As a result of your activities with the school psychologist, do you feel that there has been a change in your own ability to teach children with special learning problems?

11. Please briefly explain how the consultations and recommendations of the psychologist aided you in dealing with this child. (Please be as specific as possible)

12. Please check one square below that most adequately describes your judgment of the effectiveness of the psychological service rendered in helping this student.

Very Effective	Mostly Effective	Slightly Effective	Not Effective
☐	☐	☐	☐

13. Please add any comments which you feel may improve the value of the psychological service program.

MILWAUKEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Division of Curriculum and Instruction

June 2, 1966

MEMORANDUM - Principals' Reaction Form for ESEA Projects

To: (Addressee-Principal)

The purpose of this memorandum is to ask you, as a school principal, to share with us your opinion of ESEA projects which have operated this semester in your school. The ESEA projects are those which are funded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Completing a questionnaire on each project in each school would be a formidable task. In order to obtain your judgement as accurately and efficiently as possible, we have prepared a single chart which includes all the projects and objectives. We hope you will find it comprehensive and convenient.

This information will be supplementary to that provided by other data collecting procedures. For example, pupil achievement is not included in this list of objectives because other methods will be used to assess pupil achievement.

On the attached chart, we have listed the titles of the ESEA projects. On the left-hand side of the page you will find a listing of objectives (aims or goals) that are common to several of the projects. Cells within certain rows and columns of the chart are circled in red to indicate that these specific objectives apply to a given project in your school. Using the key shown below, please place a rating within each circled cell.

Please return this form in the enclosed self-addressed envelope by June 15, 1966. If you have any questions, call John Belton, Supervisor of Educational Research, 476-3670, Extension 394.

Use the ratings as follows:

RATING KEY

3. Project fulfilled this objective to an outstanding degree

2. Project satisfactorily reached this objective

1. Project was unsatisfactory in reaching this objective

0. I have no opinion

School_____

Key:

3 = Outstanding
2 = Satisfactory
1 = Unsatisfactory
0 = No Opinion

OBJECTIVES (AIMS OR GOALS OF E.S.E.A. PROJECTS)

Category	As a result of this project, there has been improvement in:	SAMPLE: Lower Pupil-Teacher Ratio Project No. XX	E-1 School Library Services	E-2 Expanded Reading Center Services	E-4 Additional Non-teaching Vice-Principals	E-5 Special Physical Education Teacher Program	E-6 Art Experience Program	E-7 Music Experience Program	E-8 Speech & Language Skills Building Program	E-10 Outdoor Education	SS-1 Expansion of Psychological Services
A.	Teaching-Learning Environment	(2)									
B.	Teaching Performance in This Area										
C.	Pupil Attitude	(1)									
D.	Personal Development of Pupil	(0)									
E.	Pupil-Teacher Relationship	(3)									
F.	Home-School Relations										
G.	Out-of-School Activities										
H.	Curriculum Materials										
I.	Teacher Morale	(3)									
J.	Supervision										

5/66

OBJECTIVES (AIMS OR GOALS OF E.S.E.A. PROJECTS)

School_____

Key:

3 = Outstanding
2 = Satisfactory
1 = Unsatisfactory
0 = No Opinion

Category	As a result of this project, there has been improvement in:	SAMPLE: Lower Pupil-Teacher Ratio Project No. XX	S-1A Language Arts	S-1B Foreign Language	S-1C Home Economics	S-1D Mathematics	S-1E Science	S-1F a. Grade 7 Social Studies	S-1F b. Grade 9 Citizenship	S-1F c. Grade 11 U. S. History	S-2 After-School Reading Centers	S-3 Library Services and Facilities	S-4 Secondary Vocational Experience	SS-1 Expansion of Psychological Services
A.	Teacher-Learning Environment	(2)												
B.	Teaching Performance in This Area													
C.	Pupil Attitude	(1)												
D.	Personal Development of Pupil	(0)												
E.	Pupil-Teacher Relationship	(3)												
F.	Home-School Relations													
G.	Out-of-School Activities													
H.	Curriculum Materials													
I.	Teacher Morale	(3)												
J.	Supervision													

5/66